

REMARKS

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

I. Amendments to the Claims

Claims 1, 7, 8, 10, 11, 14, 15, 18, 19, 20, 23, 24 and 25 have been amended to recite statutory subject matter to overcome the 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejection discussed in detail below.

II. Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 28 and 29 were identified as reciting allowable subject matter. The Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for this indication of allowable subject matter. Claims 28 and 29 remain unchanged and, as a result, are in condition for allowance.

Independent claims 1, 11, 15 and 19 and claims 6, 7, 8, 10, 14, 18, 20, 23, 24, 25 and 26 that depend therefrom were only rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 a for reciting non-statutory subject matter. As mentioned above, independent claims 1, 11, 15 and 19 and claims 7, 8, 10, 14, 18, 20, 23, 24 and 25 that depend therefrom were amended to overcome the 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejection. As a result, and since there are no prior art rejections, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1, 11, 15 and 19 and claims 6, 7, 8, 10, 14, 18, 20, 23, 24, 25 and 26 that depend therefrom are allowable.

III. 35 U.S.C. § 101 Rejection

Independent claims 1, 11, 15 and 19 and claims 6, 7, 8, 10, 14, 18, 20, 23, 24, 25 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 for reciting non-statutory subject matter. Specifically,

independent claims 1, 11, 15 and 19 were rejected for reciting subject matter that can be interpreted as software alone. This rejection is believed clearly inapplicable to amended independent claims 1, 11, 15 and 19 and the claims that depend therefrom for the following reasons.

Independent claims 1, 11, 15 and 19 have been amended to require more than software alone. Specifically, independent claims 1 and 19 have been amended to require a first memory, a first processor, a second memory, a second processor, a third memory and a third processor, which is specific hardware requiring more than software alone. Further independent claims 11 and 15 have been amended to require a first memory, a first processor, a second memory and a second processor, which is specific hardware requiring more than software alone.

Thus, in view of the above, it is clear that independent claims 1, 11, 15 and 19 now require more than software alone, because these independent claims require specific hardware. As a result, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1, 11, 15 and 19 and claims 6-8, 10, 14, 18, 20 and 23-26 that depend therefrom recite statutory subject matter and withdrawal of this 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejection is respectfully requested.

Furthermore, since no prior art rejections have been applied to independent claims 1, 11, 15 and 19 and claims 6-8, 10, 14, 18, 20 and 23-26 that depend therefrom, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1, 11, 15 and 19 and claims 6-8, 10, 14, 18, 20 and 23-26 that depend therefrom are now in condition for allowance.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance and an early notification thereof is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Masahiro OHO et al.

/Andrew L. Dunlap/

By 2010.04.05 14:45:27 -04'00'

Andrew L. Dunlap
Registration No. 60,554
Attorney for Applicants

ALD/led
Washington, D.C. 20005-1503
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
April 5, 2010